

9 e. a chip recognition system in the central computer to determine the value of
10 the wagers in each of the wagering locations;

11 f. a platform on the table above the predetermined wagering location wherein
12 each of the plurality of video imagers is located below the platform;

13 C1 g. an arcuate wall extending between the platform and the table, the arcuate wall
14 defining apertures therethrough, the video imagers positioned behind the
15 arcuate wall and directed through the apertures; and

16 h. a light directed to each of the wagering locations, the light projecting from
17 the arcuate wall.

Cancel claims 2, 3, and 16.

Remarks:

Claims 1 and 4-9 remain in this case, claims 2, 3, and 16 having been canceled by this Amendment. All claims stand rejected.

In the subject Office Action, the Examiner withdrew the previous indication of allowable subject matter in light of additional prior art.

The Examiner then rejected claims 1, 2, 5, and 9 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as anticipated by Schubert. Schubert teaches an event sensor, and automatic controls in response to the activation of the event sensor. As correctly and astutely pointed out by the Examiner, Schubert states at Column 4, starting at line 25, “Additionally, video cameras can be installed within a raised rail or ridge that may be disposed around the perimeter 16 for example.” However, no such raised rail or ridge is illustrated in Schubert, and one can only guess the structure of such a rail or ridge. Be that as it may, claim 1 has been amended to more distinctly claim the subject matter with the Applicants regard as their invention, further defining the arcuate wall extending from the platform to the table, and further defining the